

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

Claim 1 and 6 have been amended by deleting brackets and parentheses and inserting appropriate language and punctuation, but no change in claim scope is intended or effected.

No new matter is believed to have been added by the above amendment. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-10 remain pending in the application.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the interview held March 23, 2011, in the above-identified application. During the interview, Applicants' attorney asked whether an amendment drawn only to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, would be acceptable, without forfeiting the right to initiate a new appeal now under option (2) of paragraph 1 of the Office Action. The Examiner indicated that so long as the amendment were limited to addressing the above amendment only, options (1) and (2) could both be pursued.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US 2004/0015012 (Hammon et al), is respectfully traversed for reasons discussed in a to-be-filed Appeal Brief.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as indefinite, is respectfully traversed for reasons discussed in a to-be-filed Appeal Brief.

All of the presently-pending claims in this application are believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Harris A. Pitlick
Registration No. 38,779

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)